



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,838	09/23/2003	Michael Chaves	11347	4973
26890 7590 07/11/2008 JAMES M. STOVER TERADATA CORPORATION 2835 MIAMI VILLAGE DRIVE MIAMISBURG, OH 45342				
EXAMINER PYO, MONICA M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2161				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/11/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/668,838

Applicant(s)

CHAVES ET AL.

Examiner

MONICA M. PYO

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 January 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/31/2008 has been entered.
2. Claims 8-24 are currently pending in this application. Claims 8, 15 and 21 are independent claims. In the Amendment filed 3/31/2008, claims 8, 15 and 21 are amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The claim amendment received on 3/31/2008. The changes are acknowledged and therefore, the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejections made in a prior Office Action are withdrawn.
4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
5. Claims 8-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claims 8, 15 and 21, these claims recite the limitation "the control field identified by the control field identifier is further used by a new search in performing a searching

Art Unit: 2161

join or merge operation using the control field, and wherein the search query is automatically generated as the new search" (i.e., lines 10-12 of claim 8). However, the specification does not disclose the feature of "a new search" and the feature of "the search query is automatically generated as the new search". Thus, these claimed limitations constitutes new matter since there was no support for these claim limitation in the original specification.

Claims not specifically mentioned above are rejected by virtue of their dependency to rejected claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 8-12, 15-18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,003,730 issued to Dettinger et al. (hereinafter Dettinger) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,895,465 issued to Guha (hereinafter Guha).

Regarding Claims 8, 15 and 21, Dettinger discloses a method for providing a search query, comprising:

A). providing an Application Programming Interface (API) for receiving a search constraint and a control field identifier, as a graphical user interface receiving search

queries with field specifications (Dittinger: col. 4, lns. 23-40; col. 6, lns. 32-57; col. 9, lns. 24-38; col. 9, table 1); and

B). providing a search generating module interfaced to the API (i.e., GUI) for automatically generating a search query from the search constraint and the control field identifier (i.e., queries issued by the application 240 may be generated in response to user input), wherein the search constraint defines an operand and an operator for the search query being generated (i.e., plurality of field specifications) and wherein a control field defines a control field of a data store from which the search query is to be executed against (i.e., the logical field names to a particular physical data representation in a database) and the control field identifier is separate and apart from the search constraint (i.e., field specification with a logical field name and an associated access method) and the control field identified by the control field identifier is further used by a new search (i.e., changed search query with added conditions) using the control field, and wherein the search query is automatically generated as the new search as the refreshed or updated GUI shows all three added query conditions each of which were added by the user (Dittinger: col. 6, lns. 14-31; col. 7, lns. 50-col. 8, lns. 5; col. 9, lns. 24-38; col. 13, lns. 26-46; col. 16, lns. 48-59; figs. 3A & 3B).

C). wherein when the search query is executed records from the data store are returned representing data store records that satisfy the search constraint and have identical values for the control field identifier for each customer identification value, as query to return a firstname and lastname to meet search constraint and a specific name search result (Dettinger: col. 16, lns. 3-29, col. 17, lns. 34-42; col. 18, table III).

Although Dettinger discloses the system accessing repositories (col. lines. 6-40), Dettinger does not explicitly disclose

B). the system in performing a searching join or merge operation.

However, Guha discloses:

B). the system in performing a searching join or merge operation, as the system generates SQL that will join the tables based on whether the tables share fields representing the same concept (Guha: col. 7, lns. 19-27).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Dettinger with the teachings of Guha to utilize the SQL joining statement to enhance the database query system by joining a first database table and a second database table (Guha: abstract; col. 1, lines. 16-21).

Regarding Claim 9, Dettinger and Guha disclose the method further comprising providing a command option within the API to manually execute the search query (Dettinger: col. 17, lns. 34-42; col. 18, lns. 2-21).

Regarding Claim 10, Dettinger and Guha disclose the method further comprising presenting the records when the command option is selected (Dettinger: col. 17, lns. 34-65).

Regarding Claim 11, Dettinger and Guha disclose the method wherein the providing of the search generating module further includes interfacing the API to the search generating module over a network (Dettinger: col. 4, lns. 43-52; col. 6, lns. 13-31).

Regarding Claim 12, Dettinger and Guha disclose the method wherein the providing the API further includes interfacing the API to one or more automated applications (Dettinger: col. 5, lns. 56-col. 6, lns. 31).

Regarding Claim 16, Dettinger and Guha discloses the system wherein the search query interface includes a Graphical User Interface (GUI) application for receiving the search constraint and the control field identifier and an Application Programming Interface (API) that interfaces the GUI application to the search generating module (Dettinger: col. 4, lns. 43-52; col. 6, lns. 13-31; col. 7, lns. 50-col. 8, lns. 5; col. 16, lns. 3-29, col. 17, lns. 34-42; col. 18, table III).

Regarding Claim 17, Dettinger and Guha disclose the system wherein the search generating module automatically executes the search query and presents the records to the search query interface (Dettinger: col. 4, lns. 23-36 & 43-52; col. 6, lns. 13-31; col. 17, lns. 34-65).

Regarding Claim 18, Dettinger and Guha disclose the system wherein the search generating module executes the search query and presents the records to the search query interface when instructed to do so by the search query interface (Dettinger: col. 4, lns. 23-36 & 43-52; col. 6, lns. 13-31; col. 17, lns. 34-65).

8. Claims 13 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dettinger in view of Guha, as applied to claims 8-12, 15-18 and 21 above, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,948,040 issued to DeLorme et al. (hereinafter DeLorme).

Regarding Claim 13, Dettinger and Guha do not explicitly disclose the method further comprising interfacing the records automatically after the search query is executed a marketing campaign module.

However, DeLorme discloses: the method further comprising interfacing the records automatically after the search query is executed a marketing campaign module (DeLorme: col. 31, lns. 16-41; col. 64, lns. 56-col. 65, lns. 13 - as a marketing online advertisement).

It would have obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Dettinger and Guha with the teachings of DeLorme to utilize the marketing advertisement for travelers with the motivation to enhance the computerized travel reservation information and planning system (DeLorme: col. 1, lns. 29-46).

Regarding Claim 22, Dettinger and Guha do not explicitly disclose the system wherein the system is interfaced to a customer segmentation module.

However, DeLorme discloses the system wherein the system is interfaced to a customer segmentation module, as an itinerary of travel information SCHEDULER sub-menu (DeLorme: col. 9, lns. 65-col. 10, lns. 9; col. 33, lns. 30-52).

It would have obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Dettinger and Guha with the teachings of DeLorme to utilize the marketing advertisement for travelers with the motivation to enhance the computerized travel reservation information and planning system (DeLorme: col. 1, lns. 29-46).

Regarding Claim 23, Dettinger and Guha disclose the system wherein the system is used an instance of the search constraint and wherein the control filed identifier (Dettinger: col. 16, lns. 3-29, col. 17, lns. 34-42; col. 18, table III).

Dettinger and Guha do not explicitly disclose:

to generate a travel customer segmentation population based on a marketing campaign's search constraint representing is a trip identifier.

However, DeLorme discloses:

to generate a travel customer segmentation population based on a marketing campaign's search constraint representing is a trip identifier (DeLorme: col. 9, lns. 65-col. 10, lns. 9; cols. 64, lns. 56-col. 65, lns. 13).

It would have obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Dettinger and Guha with the teachings of DeLorme to utilize the marketing advertisement for travelers with the motivation to enhance the computerized travel reservation information and planning system (DeLorme: col. 1, lns. 29-46).

Regarding Claim 24, Dettinger and Guha and DeLorme disclose the system wherein the marketing campaign's search constraint includes at least one of a hotel stay constraint, a rental car constraint, a destination constraint, and a layover constraint (Dittinger: col. 4, lns. 23-40; col. 6, lns. 32-57) and (DeLorme: col. 14, lns. 24-35).

9. Claims 14 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dettinger in view of Guha, as applied to claims 8-12, 15-18 and 21 above, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,334,131 issued to Chakraburti et al. (hereinafter Chakraburti).

Regarding Claims 14 and 19, Dettinger and Guha disclose the method further comprising the search constraint (Dettinger: col. 4, lns. 23-40; col. 6, lns. 32-57).

Dettinger and Guha do not explicitly disclose: generating hierarchies from portions of the records when the search query is executed, wherein each hierarchy represents an aspect.

However, Chakraburti discloses: generating hierarchies from portions of the records when the search query is executed, wherein each hierarchy represents an aspect (Chakraburti: cols. 9-10; lns. 65-67 & 1-15 - as directing the search to the relevant section).

It would have obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Dettinger and Guha with the teachings of Chakraburti to utilize the hierarchical information structures with the motivation to enhance the method to implement ranking frame based hierarchical information structures (Chakraburti: col. 1, lns. 20-42).

Regarding Claim 20, Dettinger and Guha and Chakraburti disclose the wherein the hierarchies are linked to fields in the data store and can be activated from the search query interface to present different views of the hierarchies (Dettinger: col. 4, lns. 23-40; col. 6, lns. 32-57) & (Chakraburti: col. 9, lns. 65-col. 10, lns. 15 & 20-33).

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 8-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MONICA M. PYO whose telephone number is (571)272-8192. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon & Thur 7:00 - 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Monica M Pyo
Examiner
Art Unit 2161

mpyo

Art Unit: 2161

/Apu M Mofiz/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2161